# University District Zoning and Planning Regulatory Review Task Force Meeting #4

Tuesday, October 14, 2008 12 Morrill Hall 100 Church St SE 8:00 AM – 9:30 AM

#### **MEETING NOTES**

<u>Task force members present:</u> Katie Fournier, Florence Littman, Ron Lischeid, Mary Miller, Nancy Rose Pribyl, Jim Ruiz

Others present: Peg Wolff, Haila Maze, Jessica Thesing, Jan Morlock, Joe Bernard, Robb Clarksen

#### Welcome and Introductions

• Task force members and other attendees introduced themselves

#### **Parking Issues**

- After presentation and discussion of potential strategies and recommendations at last meeting, it was agreed to table this topic for now, and move on to other issues
- Parking will be revisited at a later date, with more discussion on determining recommended strategies and prioritizing them
- For more information on parking, see handouts/notes from past meetings

#### **Rezoning Discussion**

- Map included in packet shows that much of lower density residential areas in neighborhoods have already been down-zoned in previous rezoning studies
- Why is rezoning being considered? Because it is a valid tool for regulating growth, as it governs (among other things) allowed size, height, and density of new development. It is not always the appropriate tool for a specific area, but should be considered as an option
- Marcy Holmes and SE Como indicated they were not interested in revisiting rezoning for their areas; Prospect Park and Cedar Riverside might
- It was determined that a separate meeting will be convened to discuss possible rezoning issues, so that those most interested can attend and focus on specifics; date and time to be announced
- Request for additional information on (1) what is current "build out" capacity for growth, given current zoning, and (2) how does application of cluster development concept impact projects in this area

### **Design and Development Review**

- New topic was introduced: how does the development review process influence project design and what can be done to this process to address problems in the University District?
- Information provided included (1) details on the administrative review process, (2) what aspects of a development are regulated by the city and how, and (3) photos of recently approved projects for review and comparison
- The administrative review process was revamped in 2005 with a points-based system for approval; included new requirements for windows and building materials; need to focus on what aspects of this to revisit improvements were made to the system did they go far enough?
- SE neighborhoods made some suggestions earlier this year to how to improve this, including (1) requiring a higher number of points be achieved for approval and (2) adding points for consultation with neighborhood; will find a copy of this and bring forward for consideration
- Building code standards may be an issue; but this is regulated by the state (we cannot exceed state standards by law), and would require state-level legislative action to change not achievable in short term by this group
- Question regarding timelines on completion of project: yes, there is a year limit (can be extended another year); enforcement tends to be complaint-driven, and there is only so much city can do if property owner lacks funds to finish project
- How do we address "mini dorm" problem? Consider adding points for 3-4 unit buildings that have fewer than maximum allowed bedrooms
- Enforcement issues are closely related to these standards: starting with situations of deferred maintenance on rental properties, which create run-down buildings leading to an easy argument for demolition
- Mini-dorms are problematic due to too few parking spaces; also they create concentrations of unsupervised students (i.e. living in rental properties without on-site management), leading to noise and other complaints from neighbors
- Zoning code cannot require on-site manager; however, many larger rental properties do have managers
- Look at ways to address occupancy, including strategies to reduce number of unrelated people living together
- Question: would it be better to spread these sorts of developments out throughout neighborhood, rather than clustered (e.g. Lodges)?
- Is there a way via regulation to better synch number of bedrooms to occupancy standards? May be difficult to determine what constitutes a bedroom
- Regulate/monitor number of residents by number of PO boxes (i.e. how many will get mail delivery on site)
- Ways to regulate through the rental licensing process?
- Consider compiling list of "bad landlords" and circulating to students but will
  only get the worst offenders, may just result in these landlords renting to less
  desirable tenants
- Impacts on overall neighborhood character should be considered
- How do we work to reduce number of unsupervised students?

## **Next Steps**

- Next meeting will be <u>Tuesday</u>, <u>October 28</u>, same time and place
- Focus of next meeting will be continuation of design/development review topic
- Rezoning meeting to be scheduled separately